

## Meeting Notes re: Fare Enforcement (Meeting #2)

Date, time: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 // 1:00 – 2:50 PM

Location: Peter's Office, 705 Building, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor

### **STATED MEETING OBJECTIVES**

- Continue the March 1 conversation by ensuring that all perspectives on this issue have been surfaced and discussed;
- Develop a draft set of clear, vetted recommendations/options for Peter to consider re: alternatives for the current "fourth strike";
- Strategy for court/county outreach regarding tickets being referred to Shoreline; and
- Document alternative / dissenting viewpoints and strategies from this group

### **SETTING THE CONTEXT / FRAMING THE ISSUES**

The group was asked to answer the following focus questions in order to set a context frame for developing a more holistic and integrated set of recommendations for the Fare Enforcement Program. **Answers to these questions are displayed on the attached visuals.**

- What is fare enforcement for?
- Is our current state working?

As an end-note to this discussion, the group was asked on the degree of change for the ST Fare Enforcement Program ranging from no change to incremental (continuous improvement) to transformational. While the question was not answered specifically during the discussion, the options / recommendations developed by the group seem to fall into incremental, with some in transformational. A note was made that "transformational" does not imply starting over with a new Fare Enforcement Program.

### **ISSUES TO POTENTIALLY ADDRESS / INFORMATION NEEDS FOR THE GROUP**

During the discussions, several issues / information needs were raised, including the following.

NOTE: Issues from the NO/MAYBE list of ideas could also be folded into this list.

- ST Board policies may be in disagreement re: fare evasion / exclusion
- How do we hold low-income people in our framing of improvements for the Program?
- Do we know what we don't know (e.g., court dispositions of cases)?
- Prosecutor's office puts transit cases at bottom of pile
- Can we get a list of questions that people ask the courts?

### **OPTIONS / POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

The group began discussing broader options and recommendations, in relation to the context-setting completed earlier, including:

- Wait until Metro Transit fully implements their revised Fare Enforcement program and capture their lessons learned before we make any major (transformational) changes to our program
- Can we develop information campaigns for disproportionately impacted audiences? Who and how do we microtarget for these campaigns?
- Can we get more comprehensive data about fare enforcement impacts from the courts (e.g., demographics of fare evaders vs. demographics of riders)?
- Initiate a survey (or focus group) to better understand the fare evader population. NOTE: we can tap into ST's research person for this work?

- In-house Case Development prosecutor – the outcome of this is that we help prosecutor's office make decisions re: human factor vs. criminal intent. Human factor solutions would look like housing and drug rehab

### **NEXT STEPS**

- To "harvest" as many general / specific recommendations as possible, Rhonda asked group members to email her recommendations by Friday, March 8. SUGGESTION: Use the attached matrix for identifying recommendations. Once compiled, these recommendations will be sent back to the group.
- Rhonda will brief Peter next Tuesday on the efforts and outputs of the group to date, including a review of the first run of recommendations.
- Rhonda will schedule Meeting #3 for the group to continue to identify and refine a discrete set of recommendations that includes outcomes and impacts.